DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 409 UD 031 802

AUTHOR Allen, Rick
TITLE What Space Makes of Us: Thirdspace, Identity Politics, and Multiculturalism.
PUB DATE 28 Mar 97
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Differences; Curriculum Development; *Epistemology; *Multicultural Education; *Spatial Ability
IDENTIFIERS Foucault (Michel); *Identity (Psychological); Postmodernism; Spatial Factors

ABSTRACT

Space is related to power in that it is critical to the social production and reproduction of difference. This paper re-imagines a critical multiculturalism that embraces critical spatial theory and postmodern identity politics. In an overview of postmodern spatial theory, the works of Lefebvre (1974), E. Soja (1989, 1996), and M. Foucault (1986) on the characteristics and problems of modern spatial assumptions and epistemologies are described. The idea of Thirdspace is heuristically presented as the postmodernization of spatial thinking. The theory of spatial underdevelopment is added as a metaphor for the active production of dominant and marginalized ways of thinking about space in its material, imagined, and social forms. Spatial underdevelopment is also argued to be connected to the production of identity. The Thirdspatial methodology of spatial praxis is described as a critical spatial approach to deconstructing hegemonic spatial paradigms. These critical views of space are also used to rethink the problems of modernistic identity politics and to reconstruct a more spatially concerned postmodern identity politics. What spatially aware multicultural curriculum should entail if it takes these arguments into account is described. (Author/SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 409 409

What Space Makes of Us: Thirdspace, Identity Politics, and Multiculturalism

by Rick Allen
UCLA Graduate School of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rick Allen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented at the
American Educational Research Association Conference
Chicago, Illinois
March 28, 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD031602

Abstract

Space is related to power in that it is critical to the social production and reproduction of difference. This paper re-imagines a critical multiculturalism that embraces critical spatial theory and postmodern identity politics. In an overview of postmodern spatial theory, Lefebvre, Soja, and Foucault's work on the characteristics and problems of modernistic spatial assumptions and epistemologies are described. The idea of Thirdspace is heuristically presented as the postmodernization of spatial thinking. The author adds the theory of spatial underdevelopment as a metaphor for the active production of dominant and marginalized ways of thinking about space in its material, imagined, and social forms. Spatial underdevelopment is also argued to be connected to the production of identity. The Thirdspatial methodology of spatial praxis is described as a critical spatial approach to deconstructing hegemonic spatial paradigms. These critical views of space are also used to re-think the problems of modernistic identity politics and to reconstruct a more spatially-concerned postmodern identity politics. And finally, the author describes what a spatially-aware multicultural curriculum should entail if it takes into account the arguments presented.

What Space Makes of Us: Thirdspace, Identity Politics, and Multiculturalism

Much is being made now about the connection between space and power, and rightfully so, since the critical study of space has been neglected for far too long. For most, this new inquiry into space is still dictated by old spatial habits that move them to ask, "What do we make of space?" One type of answer addresses how to use material space better or fairly. Still other responses center on what space is conceptually, such as in the disciplines of geometry and physics. And I, too, will discuss these material and conceptual aspects of space in this paper.

However, some spatial theorists are also concerned about what space makes of us. This does not mean that these theorists think that space determines what we are or how we behave in some teleological, deterministic way. What they do wonder, though, is how do our daily interactions with the products and production of socially constructed spaces make us who we are, what we call ourselves, and what we call each other. These theoretical pushes to reconceptualize space is reflective of the politicizing of the spatial, which is essentially everything. And where there are politics and space, there is domination and marginalization. It is very important then to carefully and critically consider how space is being imagined politically in social theory so that space is not simply recast as a metaphorical and material tool to reproduce marginalization.

This political problematic is especially crucial to the study of curriculum. Curricular theory is interrelated and interdependent with developments in the social sciences. As spatial language continues to proliferate in social science discourses, it is important for those interested in questions of critical theory in curriculum to engage and critique the ways in which spatial representations, or spatial metaphors, are situated in curricular discourses and literatures. In particular, the politics of space in curriculum needs to be deconstructed and made critical, thus building upon that which is already identified as critical pedagogy.

The topic of multiculturalism in curricula is a good place to begin a critical spatial study in education because many people already relate the need to study the interactions of different cultures to commonly perceived spatial practices, like ghettoization, migration, integration, and segregation, with political consequences. As people move (or are moved away from), their ideas, cultures, practices, and politics are related to patterns of traveling, dispersal, or confinement. In education, multicultural studies examine how educational institutions should handle questions of difference that are in part linked to these unsettled and marginalizing spatial practices. For those who study and practice critical pedagogy, the political imagination offered by radical identity politics is crucial to developing expressions of critical multiculturalisms that critique dominant multicultural positions. However, the study of radical identity politics in critical multiculturalism is under spatial attack. Radical identity politics has been pejoratively cast as being "fragmenting" (a spatial metaphor) or socially disruptive. Some liberal criticisms have gone as far as to use a "blame-the-victim" paradigm, suggesting that radical identity politics, not to mention poststructuralism, postmodernism, postfeminist, and postcolonial theories, are the cause of the deterioration of the nation-state and its ability to

protect the marginalized from the ravages of capitalism. These criticisms of radical identity politics are troubling because they use spatial metaphors that can be related to "hidden" ideological spatial assumptions. What needs to be developed are critical spatial theories that rely on the critiques of marginalized voices to identify, deconstruct, and transform problematic conceived notions of space.

Modernistic, liberal critiques of radical identity politics exemplify hidden spatial assumptions that are socially marginalizing. When spatial theorists such as Lefebvre and Soja talk about space having been neglected in the social sciences, they are not suggesting that these discourses have been detached from spatial conceptualizations. Thinking poststructurally about space, all theories imply a notion of space, whether explicit or not. Furthermore, some spatial conceptualizations become hegemonic. The critical question is how do hegemonic, modernistic conceptualizations of space marginalize "Other" spatialities and limit our political imagination as it relates to identity politics? In other words, what does a postmodern spatial imagination and praxis entail? To better understand this position, I will first discuss the ontological importance of space.

Ontology, Space, and Trialectics

Lefebvre (1974), Foucault (1986), and Soja (1989 and 1996) have all argued that space is an irreducible, essential quality of humanness and social being. Soja is very specific in these regards stating that social being is produced by the ontological triad of space, time, and society. This assertion may not seem so bold or important at first glance, but consider how time and society, both separately and interdependently, have been developed in the social sciences. The interpretive nature of this ontological triad can be

expressed as spatiality, historicity, and sociality, and their structured knowledges have been disciplined into geography, history, and sociology.

Unfortunately, the problem with, at least initially, suggesting that each part of these triads should be equally represented is that spatiality and geography are not a regular part of the social scientist's vernacular. Consider how social scientists are accustomed to historicizing social relations to study the reproduction of class divisions, such as in historical materialism. Social theorists often talk about the "weight of history" and use terms like "socio-historical." Conversely, ask a social scientist to discuss spatialities or the interplay between geography, history, and sociology, and you may get a puzzled look. For instance, what is the "socio-spatial" or "geohistorical"? Space has been structured out of the basic way in which social problems are contextualized. Any good contextualization will examine the interplay between each part of the triad (and there could certainly be more than three essential qualities), but I will spend most of my discussion talking about space since it has been so underdeveloped.

The lack of a critical spatial language in the social sciences should be cause for tremendous concern since space is essential to life. No event can take place without space. No memory is without a spatial essence. To remember a time is to remember a place. To have a thought is to have a place for that thought. One of the first acts of human life is to occupy space. Moving, communicating, sensing, and behaving are all spatial. Sex and sexuality is spatial as well. *Nothing humans do can escape space; life cannot be lived nor imagined without it.* And it is a struggle to think of ways to talk about spatiality. Just as historical and social sensibilities never fully grasp that which they seek to represent, spatial sensibilities are also "partially" situated. Given the lack of overtly spatialized language in many social science discourses and the

poststructural view that all theories of social being imply a conceptualization of space, the question is begged, "What hegemonic social paradigm has created the underdevelopment of a critical spatial language?" To address this question, I will turn to epistemological concerns of how we come to know space and how dominate spatial conceptualizations are hidden from critical view.

Modernistic Spatialities, Spatial Epistemology, and Thirdspace

Lefebvre's critique of modernistic spatialities makes possible the theoretical development of a postmodern geographical imagination (Soja, 1989). His primary target is the subjectivist-idealist/objectivist-materialist binary that has colonized spatial thought in modernity. He calls this binary the "double illusion" because each side "refers back to the other, reinforces the other, and hides behind the other." [p. 27, Lefebvre, 1974 #102][1] The choice of "illusion" is a creative trope since it can mean that one is not "seeing" the "truth" in both a material or imagined sense, such as in a magician's trick.

He calls one side of the double illusion the "illusion of transparency." This is the space of the "imagination," a site of the mental contemplation of space. Space in this view is readily intelligible, free of traps, and, thus, open to the free play of human agency. These are the spaces of the subjectivist-idealists, such as idealist philosophers like Hegel, who see rational thought as transcendental, thus masking the socio-spatial production of power. Rational thought is represented as a design waiting to be discovered and then deployed into a space of utopian agency. When planned changes based in this paradigm are implemented, their designs fail due to a naive view of space as being totalizable. The explanations given to evaluate the failure of the change center on design flaws rather than problematic spatial assumptions. Failed designs

[1]Lefebvre's addition of "hides behind the other" serves as a critique of the binary implied by the term "iterative," which often includes the first part of his statement that says "refers back to the other, reinforces the other..."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are symbolically reworked into the language of the new designs to the point where representations of space substitute for the real. This type of spatiality, given its idealistic abstractions, has developed critics who have a distaste for the abstract emphasis on spatial imaginations as opposed to the material.

The second side of the binary is called the "realistic illusion" or the "illusion of opacity." This is the space dominated by the "real." Objects have more social value than thoughts or imagination. In the realistic illusion, the world is naturalistic and mechanistic. Space is to be accurately measured and painstakingly described. This objectivist-materialist view believes natural, material objects to be real since they can be "directly sensed." The imagined is less valuable since it is "unseen" and "unmeasurable." The opaqueness associated with reflecting on the construction of ideas only muddies the essential truth of materiality. Those associated with the realistic illusion tend to be social scientists or scientific socialists who are attracted to more material and structural analyses like historical materialism. Economism, naturalism, and empiricism also fall into the realistic illusion.

The double illusion characterizes the more famous debates of modernism, particularly the ones of subject/object, idealist/materialist, and, to some extent, structure/agency, as related to certain hegemonic conceptualizations of space. Moreover, Lefebvre saw these dualisms as illusory because they conceal social space as a social product. The double illusion can be synthesized by asking the question, "Does the material world produce consciousness or does consciousness produce the material world?" Lefebvre and Soja have answered by saying that space is *both* real (material) and imagined (conceptual) simultaneously (represented from here on as "real-and-imagined"), *but it is also something much more.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This something more is a "Thirdspace" that is not a simple pragmatic synthesis of the real-and-imagined, but an "Other" space that is trialectically, not dialectically, interrelated and interdependent to the real-and-imagined. For Lefebvre and Soja, the Thirdspace for the real-and-imagined binary is social space. Mental (imagined/conceptual) space, physical (real/material) space, and social space all interreact and interrelate with each other. Lefebvre was fascinated with social space because that was his metaphorical site where social difference is produced, the place where real-and-imagined space could no longer hide behind each other now that there is the disorienting Other called social space standing at its side. Social space is a symbol of what is produced by the real-and-imagined binary. It also represents spatial power differentials that exist before constructing what is the dominant real-and-imagined conceptualization of space.

Being ever wary of binaries, Lefebvre divided social space into "three moments": perceived space, conceptual space, and lived space. In perceived space, reality equals perception. Perceived space is the mundane spaces of everyday life and its spatial practices. Perceived space unwittingly complies with production and reproduction, creating an a-critical sense of social continuity and cohesion. In modern capitalism, perceived space includes job routines, travel routes, urban life, and leisure. Perceived space has been materialized and naturalized, making it an empirical space to be measured and described by objectivist-materialists. It is the nostalgic space that exists of its own natural essence and is not seen as having been socially produced (Soja, 1996).

Conceived space is the imagined representations of space. It is particularly important because it is the space that dominates perceived and lived space. It is the space hegemonically orchestrated by those seduced by

idealistic agency, or the illusion of transparency, such as scientists, planners, urbanists, technocrats, policymakers and researchers, educational reformers, and some artists. We all have conceived spatialities, but these formally educated and powerful people, especially in a capitalist system, have the means to identify what is socially lived, perceived, and conceived, and then structure their own versions into what becomes disciplinary knowledge and institutional control. Foucault's trialectic of space, knowledge, and power speaks to this conceptual-spatial domination that is produced via the rules of hegemonic rationality and its systematized codes, signs, metaphors, and tropes, that is, language (Soja, 1996). Hegemonic conceived space are the cool centers where rationality is plotted and structured from the illusion of transparency. To play on a line from Castells, when people find themselves able to control the world, they simply expand the knowledge of their own community to the size of the world.[2] This process is managed through the control of conceived space.

Lived space is the space of representation. Its existence is dominated by conceived space; it is "the space which the imagination...seeks to change and appropriate" {p. 68, Soja, 1996 #168}. It is the hot "margins" of struggle, the "underground" of social life (Soja, 1996). Lived spaces are produced by modernistic spatialities through rationality control and are hidden away from perceptual view by the double illusion. Lefebvre describes lived space as a space of complex symbol systems that may or may not have been codified into language. He particularly speaks of artists who are not just painting pictures

---

[2]The original line from Castells was a critique of "fragmenting localization," a very orthodox view of the redistributive power of nation-state spaces, that said, "[W]hen people find themselves able to control the world, they simply shrink the world to the size of their community." {p. 210, Calhoun, 1995 #171} What needs to be better elaborated is the purpose and politics of "shrinking the world" because Castells is assuming an essentialized and naturalized "world" metaphor to support his redistributive metaphor, often associated with liberal progressivism and structural Marxists.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that represent space, but are creating symbols of dominated, lived space that act socially as spaces of representation or "counterspaces" (Soja, 1996). Philosophers, writers, ethnographers, and psychoanalysts also deal in lived spatialities because they describe lived spaces that are dominated by conceived space and are also seen as different by culturally-normative perceived space, or spatial practice. These lived spatialities retain, or even emphasize, a partial unknowability through a non-verbal subliminality, a characteristic that the scientifically-minded find disturbing. They are in a sense spaces of "resistance" since to be "fully-known" is to also be essentialized.

Lived space is created in interreactive and interdependent relationships with conceived and perceived space. Lived space does not exist without these two other moments of social space. The domination of idealistic conceptual space and the essentialized, naturalized reality of perceived space synergistically act to "Other" that which is neither, yet inseparable, that is, lived space. Those who inhabit and describe marginalized lived spatialities are often psychologized as "being different to be different." The binary, particularly of the double illusion, socially constructs a deviant other by, ironically, masking the social construction of lived space. Therefore, lived spaces are the sites where power is operationalized relative to a denigration of the marginalized "Other". Lefebvre's lived spaces are also the source for what has become known as Thirdspace.

In *Thirdspace*, Soja (1996) creatively locates Lefebvre's double illusion critique and three moments of social space within an epistemological typology consisting of Firstspace, Secondspace, and Thirdspace. Firstspace epistemologies are the fusion of perceived space and the realistic illusion. Its emphasis is on the analytical deciphering of spatial practice. It privileges materialized spatialities that are to be empirically measured and described in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

great detail. Firstspace sees a natural pattern or order of distribution that is absolute. Human existence can be readily expressed and understood through the cartographical or topographical mapping of concrete geographies. In general, Firstspace's objectivist-materialist paradigm pushes for a quantitative, disciplinary, empirically-oriented science of space that will accrue a continual flow of spatial facts.

Firstspace is the most dominant form of spatial analysis. This phenomenon is not surprising, but it is problematic. Since Firstspace operates at the moment of spatial perception, it represents they way we practice space on an everyday basis. The problem is when the spatial practice in use is informed by a conceived spatiality that is uncritical of the ways in which spatial reality is produced.[3] If perception equals reality, then how can one measure what they cannot imagine existing? Firstspace has been colonized into a positivistic epistemology that takes as a given the essential reality and social meaning of the material objects and patterns that spatial science describes. Space is nostalgic and passive in Firstspace because conceived and lived spaces are not a privileged nor well-explicated part of the Firstspatial imagination.

The problems of Firstspace has political consequences. Firstspace has been socially produced to reinforce a view of the world that sees space as an arena for the historical unfolding of human events. At best, space is cast as an ever-changing, natural sequence of geographies, such as that from tribal villages to modern cities. The reasons for changes in spatial materiality and spatial imaginations are explained via factors external to the critical discussion of space itself. For example, the Marxist version of space, popular amongst

---

[3]Obviously, this is not to say that a new form of spatial practice could arise that would be spatially critical. However, the poststructuralist in me senses that any transformative structuring of conceptual space will simulataneously structure counterspaces. The struggle for liberation as it relates to the social production of space and the spatial production of difference in society is an ongoing process of politics.

social scientists and scientific socialists, positions space as the material outcomes of historico-social class struggle. Much of Marxist spatial work centers on Firstspace epistemology. However, this one way flow of spatial production is symptomatic of the realistic illusion's to avoidance of the complexity of concepts and the imagination. To give credence to imagined space that might question assumed views of material space would be seen as counterproductive to the modernistic project of historically-based class revolution.

Representing a combination of conceived space and the illusion of transparency, Secondspace epistemologies are more likely to focus on spatial imaginations than Firstspace epistemologies. This conceptual orientation in Secondspace is at least partially due to a perceived closed-mindedness of the materialistic Firstspace epistemologies. Secondspace questions the naturalness of Firstspace by asking what role various ways of thinking have to do with how we perceive the material world. Some of the best known philosophical debates of modernism came from Secondspace epistemological counters to Firstspace. In this duality, Secondspace developed arguments for considering subjectivity as opposed to objectivity, idealism as opposed to materialism, agency as opposed to structure, and abstract space as opposed to concrete space. Correspondingly, these debates were part of disciplinary antagonisms such as art versus science. Of course, Firstspace and Secondspace analyses have critiqued each other so much that it is sometimes hard to tell which is which, not to mention that each has appropriated arguments from the other to support their own spatial positions.

However, Secondspace does have characteristics that, for the sake of heuristics, are distinguishable from Firstspace. Secondspace is the space dominated by those who desire to change the world to match their conceived

image of how the world should be. The most influential of these have also had the means, to some extent, to accomplish this feat. Secondspace is developed and controlled by architects such as Frank Lloyd Wright, urban utopianists such as John Dewey, spatial poets such as Gaston Bachelard and Walter Benjamin, or idealist philosophers such as Hegel. It focuses on the ideational constructs of space in the mind that then project out to the material world. From this view, imagined space becomes that which is real, and material space is an essentialized, and therefore dead signifier. Situational spatialities and their relationship to power are non-existent, or rationalized in essentialistic ways, such that ideas can transcend space, or be adjusted to fit pre-conceived spatial categories. For example, Soja describes the urban utopianist (like Deweyian educational reformers) as one who is "seeking social and spatial justice through the application of better ideas, good intentions, and improved social learning[.]" [p. 79, Soja, 1996 #168] Their emphasis is on "better" conceptual space with no attention to how to identify and transgress spatial domination, that is, outside of a retreat back to positivistic Firstspace "material" analyses.

For Lefebvre and Soja, the most troubling aspect of Secondspace, and spatial epistemologies in general, are those approaches which relate closely to "idealist philosophies...or from what might be called the idealization of epistemology, its confident representation as a masterful and complete ordering of reality." [p. 80, Soja, 1996 #168] More specifically, Lefebvre was concerned with the universalizing spatialities of modernist discourses. These types of idealized and idealistic (that is, "blind" to social space) Secondspace epistemologies are the tools of control for institutions and nation-states, governing through the domination of the knowledge, space, and power trialectic. Both lived and perceived space in modernity are monitored and coerced by Secondspace. Casting modernism as spatially problematic calls for

a resituation of counter-modernisms such as the post-discourses. To quote Soja at length,

> Looking back over the past three decades, this seemingly over-drawn concentration on the power of epistemology and on the "dominance" of Secondspace explanatory perspectives...makes much more sense. Here was the most powerful blockage to the creative rethinking of spatiality, to the trialectical reassertion of Spatiality in ontological conjunction with Sociality and Historicality, to the struggle against all forms of spatial reductionism and disciplinary fragmentation. The broader philosophical hegemony of what I will call modernist epistemologies and their tacit silencing of other knowledges would become the primary focus for a series of post-prefixed (postmodern, poststructuralist, post-Marxist, postcolonial) and related feminist critiques of modernism more generally. Lefebvre's targeting of Secondspace epistemologies as dominant and dominating was thus an important precursor to these more recent developments[.] (pp. 80-1)

This statement suggests that the post-discourses and radical feminist critiques represent an "Other" type of spatiality that is connected to yet separate from the trap of the double illusion and its related Firstspace-Secondspace epistemologies. Although not all of these discourses are overtly spatial, Soja suggests that the spatiality that they often imply is one that deconstructs the Firstspace-Secondspace duality. Soja does wonder, though, what these discourses would look like if spatiality was given explicit ontological primacy with historicity and sociality.

Soja's call for the ontological importance of space in critical social theory and critical feminisms is located in his description of Thirdspace epistemologies. Thirdspace is the "deconstruction and heuristic reconstitution of the Firstspace-Secondspace duality." Thirdspace is a means to radically open Firstspace and Secondspace knowledges for the purpose of creating new social possibilities. In Thirdspace, *all* epistemologies must be re-written relative to the ontological assertion of space, along with new intersectionalities with spatiality, historicity, and sociality. Although I do not have the space to include lengthy descriptions of Thirdspace examples, I will mention that Soja (1996) argues that bell hooks' *Yearning* (1990), Gyatri Spivak's "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1988), Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1979), and Gloria Anzaldúa's

Borderlands/La Frontera (1987) provide the best examples of what could be called Thirdspace.

The problem with launching a Thirdspace project is that lived space, the creative source of Thirdspace, has already been dominated and colonized by the power of the double illusion. However, no starting point is ever "pure", and it is spatially problematic to even suggest or desire such a utopian clean slate that imagines a place where differences can be erased rationally. So, I will next discuss a Thirdspatial methodology that can act as an engine for deconstructing the double illusion and creating spaces of transformation.

Thirdspace Methodology, Spatial Underdevelopment, and Spatial Praxis

One of the dilemmas facing Thirdspace methodological development is connecting deconstructions of the Firstspace-Secondspace duality to a radical political project of solidarity with marginalized communities. This is especially difficult when some types of postmodernisms and poststructuralisms have been critiqued as being politically damaging to the marginalized. For example, the more apocalyptic postmodernisms have been attacked because neo-conservatives have used them to suggest a state of positional relativism where any epistemological position has the same social weight as any other (Best & Kellner, 1991; Soja, 1993). But, a view from privilege, already overdeveloped, should not be given as much dialectical weight as a view from the margins when the privileged was created at the expense of the marginal (Hammer & McLaren, 1991). How can a similar spatial relativism, where one spatiality is no more problematic than another, be avoided or countered?

I would like to begin my argument by considering the possibilities of the term "development" as a spatial metaphor. It is an interesting word because it has meanings that imply the production of both real-and-imagined space.

Development in the traditional sense of "real," or Firstspace, can mean "an occurrence, event, or situation" or that spatial "happening" that is perceivable and has socially validated discursive value. Development can also refer to the "real" of Firstspace in that it means "the economic and material creation or growth of jobs, housing, education, etc..." Development also references a Secondspace imagined spatiality in that it can mean "the cognitive or intellectual growth or structuring of one's mind through learning." These varying definitions become interrelated and interdependent when they are thought of as an example of the Firstspace-Secondspace duality. Development as Firstspace is the recognition of changes that arise in Firstspace that are based on the perceived natural and material spaces that are assumed to be unproblematic. Although Firstspace developments act as material sites or stages for social problems, what is not questioned is why they are perceived at all, let alone why the events themselves are read in various ways. Development as Secondspace is the changing of the world through a universality of properly rationalized conceived space without recognition of the maintenance of perceived space and the domination of lived space. These definitions alone hide behind each other and mask the problems of power in social space.

However, the definition that has the most invigorating potential is the metaphor drawn from photography that describes development as "a process for making images clear or seeable when they were not clear or seeable before." This definition harkens back to Lefebvre's strategic use of the term "illusion." To be able to "see" (a metaphor for perceiving reality) conceptual space must be changed. For a magician to learn an illusion, she must learn it from another magician to perpetuate the seen, yet, unseen mystery. As a Marxist, Lefebvre was not as concerned with repeating the illusion as he was with creating conceptual ways to enable the audience (i.e.-the marginalized) to

see through the trickery. Lefebvre's project was then to critique Secondspace because it was the key to rethinking the double illusion. The power of conceptual space is that it can change perceptions, and, thus, everyday spatial practices. Those who change conceptually often describe experiences of "seeing" (i.e.-noticing, recognizing, and validating from any sense stimuli) things that they did not notice before. As Soja argues, the question is not whether spatialities are either real or imagined because they are always both. For example, development is not either an occurrence or cognitive growth, it is both, and more.

The more important question is whose version of the real-and-imagined of development, or any spatial metaphor, is conceptually dominant and how did it get to be that way? To answer this question, I will borrow a political economy term from the debate on Thirdworld or urban economic development policy called "underdevelopment." Underdevelopment represents a critique of the developed-undeveloped binary in capitalistic, liberal policy. "Developed" and "undeveloped" are Firstspace descriptors that have been used to quantify and communicate the degree of capitalistic benefit relative to economic conditions. Some argue that material conditions are stratified according to class and that resources, as spatial reality, need to be redistributed towards the undeveloped regions. Others claimed that people in these undeveloped regions were poor because they lacked the knowledge to change their spatial conditions. The concept of underdevelopment is an attempt to break this Firstspace-Secondspace binary. Underdevelopment theory argues that capitalism actively produces undeveloped spaces in a process of underdevelopment. This theory is premised on the notion that capitalism is a "zero-sum game" where getting ahead necessarily means that someone else is left behind. Regions of development are actually areas of "overdevelopment" because they grow from

an over-accumulation of wealth. Underdeveloped regions are those places that are politically and economically marginalized through relations with dominant capitalist places (Wallerstein, 1979).

The political economy version of underdevelopment made famous by Wallerstein is still rather Firstspatial, even though it definitely is aimed at the idealization of development policy in Secondspace. It is a critique of how to read Firstspace material development. However, what is not always expressed in the political economy version of underdevelopment are the sources for this conceptual shift in some Western scholars that enabled a perceptual change of material space. In other words, what were the origins of the Secondspatial change that was necessary for the Firstspace-Secondspace deconstruction and reconstitution as the Thirdspatial "underdevelopment"?

The critiques of development were coming from the voices of those who were colonized and marginalized by the power imbalances of imperial capitalism, such as the narratives developed in postcolonial theory. The deconstruction of modernistic development metaphors came from lived spatialities of those dominated by the double illusion. Secondspace creativity and Firstspace change came from Thirdspace and life as lived on the margins. What was not seen at the conceptual center of knowledge and power in development theory became "seen" as a critical spatial theory moved in from a place of domination.[4] Spatial underdevelopment is then conceptual as well as material, imagined as well as real. Spatial underdevelopment involves a masking or silencing of voices from geohistorically underdeveloped regions, not just an economic and material hardship. The conceptualizations of space coming from subaltern lived spaces must, therefore, be brought to the center of

[4]The same poststructural elements of "discovery" are characteristic of scientific knowledges generally, as Thomas Kuhn has argued so well (Kuhn, 1970).

spatial discourse if Firstspace-Secondspace dualities are to be problematized with any rigor.

Turning to issues of identity brings the discussion back to my original question, "What does space make of us?" Identity production is also related to the domination of lived space by conceived space. The connection between identity and lived space makes sense if we think of identity as not just a name, but a narrative of life as lived by those on the margins. Those who have the power to do so create dominant versions of conceived space that matches their own lived and perceived space, and actively produce the identity of the "Other" in the narratives that come from daily interaction with the Other. Of course, their power is both imagined, in that it is refereed by idealized rationality, and real, in that there are material connections and consequences. Identities are produced from the interaction between lived spaces that are different from hegemonic conceived and perceived space. Difference in the double illusion is "Othered" as subaltern identities. Spatial underdevelopment corresponds to the active production of identities in territories of hegemonic domination such as barrios, ghettos, reservations, colonies, or domestic households. Marginalized identities go beyond difference for the sake of difference; they are representational of dominated spatialities that those who promote hegemonic modernistic spatialities cannot readily perceive, let alone value. Discussing the production of identity then brings out issues of spatial domination that may have been underdeveloped metaphorically or materially.

The most promising of Thirdspace methodologies brings together the critiques I have presented so far into something called *spatial praxis* (Soja & Hooper, 1993). Spatial praxis gives methodological life to what I have previously theorized as spatial underdevelopment. Spatial praxis is the combining of the politics of identity (or location) and geohistorical

underdevelopment to deconstruct and reinvigorate the dialectic between spatial metaphor and spatial materiality . In spatial praxis, spatial metaphors represent the linguistic aspects of Secondspace and the knowledge, space, power trialectic. The spatial materiality of spatial praxis represents Firstspace. Together, these two parts comprise the Firstspace-Secondspace duality to be deconstructed (but not destroyed) just as I have argued previously. What is really different in spatial praxis is the positioning of Identity and geohistorical underdevelopment as an initial, contingent, and strategic operationalization of Thirdspace. Since identity and underdevelopment are so closely related to Secondspace domination, they are given a Thirdspace position in spatial praxis so that the real-and-imagined must address spatial underdevelopment.

One could argue that this example of Thirdspace in spatial praxis is just using another version of a real-and-imagined binary, and they would be right. However, the political question is whose version of the real-and-imagined becomes dominant and how do we deconstruct that hegemony. This Thirdspace also places importance on the marginalizing effects of capitalistic underdevelopment and the related production of marginal, and, therefore, dominant identities. The spatial praxis of Thirdspace is a way to politically reinsert the spatialities produced by domination back into the center of dominant discourses. Spatial praxis takes as a given the poststructural and critically pragmatic notion that every conceived space will structure marginalization. Spatial praxis is one realm of theory that addresses these concerns. But, Thirdspace should be radically open. As spatial praxis develops more in social science discourses, a critique of the identity-geohistorical underdevelopment binary may be developed as well.

Counter-hegemony, Postmodern Identity Politics, and Multiculturalism

In a critical multiculturalism, the concept of hegemony is crucial to disordering oppressive rationalities and knowledges of control. The identification of oppressive rationalities partially hinges upon a recognition or perception of socio-cultural differences and their political significance. Through spatial underdevelopment theory, difference can be re-imagined as being actively produced and reproduced through the domination of lived space by conceptual space. Difference can no longer be seen as naturally given distinctions separate from the production of space because as conceptual space changes, so does lived space, which is the site of identity emergence and maintenance. Hegemony is maintained through the processes of spatial underdevelopment in their material and imagined forms. Identity production in spatial underdevelopment represents the articulation of social and spatial domination in an ever-shifting, multiple-bordered milieu of hegemonic territories or "Othering" sites.

Counter-hegemonic projects needs to be re-imagined given the productive dimension of space in shaping identity. Counter-hegemonic critiques must consider Thirdspace, seeking to sympathetically deconstruct Firstspace-Secondspace binaries, such as the double illusion of modernism. Conceived space, as the site of the mental ordering of spatiality, must be particularly scrutinized by Thirdspace methodologies such as spatial praxis. Lived space descriptions and symbolic representations should be given a privileged place at the center of spatial thought. Identity production and geohistorical underdevelopment should guide conceptual attention to the margins, which are the locations of "creativity" and social transformation.

Current counter-hegemony identity politics usually have not embraced the more Thirdspatial postcolonial and radical feminist critiques of modernistic spatial imaginations. Unfortunately, the politics of difference (or identity politics) has been conceptually, and therefore, perceptually constrained by the dualism of liberal humanism and modernist identity politics (Soja & Hooper, 1993). Liberal humanism has sought to oppose conservative, class maintaining hegemony by arguing for the belief in a universal "we." Equality and democracy are liberal humanist technologies of control that seek to minimize the perceived problems caused by differences in people. Difference in this sense is seen as something to be accommodated, if not overcome. Modernist identity politics imagines binary oppressive relationships such as masculine/feminine, capital/labor, white/black, or colonizer/colonized. It imagines a unified subaltern group that struggles to resist and/or defeat their particular oppressor. The radical subjectivity utilized in modernist identity politics often universalizes its own cause to the exclusion of other marginalized groups. This homogenizing of subaltern subjectivity may be part of the conceived cohesiveness that is believed to be necessary to overcome the oppressor.

The problem with these modernistic counter-hegemonies is that the liberal humanist/modernist identity politics binary constructs "fragmentation" as an unwanted social development. Liberal humanists are Secondspatial in that they believe in the adherence to universal principles as the way to combat the problems caused by difference. If a large number of people agree that a social principle is valid, then, as Durkheim states, it is the responsibility of individuals to give up their selfish desires and abide by "common sense." Difference in this view is subversive if it counters dominant opinion. Arguments like postmodernism or poststructuralism are called "fragmenting" because they are seen as disruptive to the project of producing a unified "we" with a shared

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

common sense. Fragmentation is a spatial metaphor that implies that there existed a previous "we." This mythical "we" linguistically constructs fragmentation as a political device to place blame for the material consequences related to identity production on those discourses the critique universalizing, idealist rationalities.

Although modernist identity politics is called fragmenting, too, by liberal humanists, it still has its own version of fragmentation that it directs at those who are perceived to share the identity of a particular bipolar subaltern group but do not place all of their energies into the singular "revolutionary" cause. The homogenization process involved in creating the counter-hegemonic subjectivity causes many who have had lived experiences that are different from the dominant conceptualizations to be politically resistant. Those who do support the cause of the singular oppressed against the singular oppressor label those who are not supportive of the cause, but are identified as one of the oppressed, as being "fragmenting" or as having "false consciousness." For example, the Marxist who is "not Marxist enough."

The dilemma of both modernistic counter-hegemonies is that they do not account for how their idealized, rationalized, and totalized visions of what space should be blinds them to thinking about how space, particularly their own conceived space, actively produces the very fragmenting that they find subversive.[5] Difference in both cases is feared and invokes spatial metaphors with negatively viewed meanings such as fragmentation. Conceived space once again dominates lived space, and the expressed subjugation in the form of multiple or fragmented identities is attacked.

---

[5]However, I do not want to suggest that liberal humanism and modernist identity politics are spatially equal. Liberal humanism, although counter-hegemonic, has been developed more in education in both real-and-imagined terms and often has sunstantial state backing. Modernist identity politics are more likely to be practiced by those who are indeed truly marginalized. I must therefore state that my critique is meant to be much more sympathetic to those practicing modernist identity politics than the liberal humanists.

The choices for a counter-hegemonic identity politics do not have to be constrained within this modernistic binary. Since there are multiple dominating conceived spaces, their will always be multiple lived spaces representing multiple identities in any individual, or for that matter, group. Also, spatial underdevelopment and identity production are an ongoing process. So the new production of marginalized identities needs to be figured into the conceptualization of radical identity politics. One political view that accomplished this task is called "postmodern identity politics." As the Thirdspace of counter-hegemonic identity politics, postmodern identity politics is "a polyvocal postmodernism that maintains a commitment to radical social change while continuing to draw (selectively, but sympathetically) from the most powerful critical foundations of modernist identity politics." [p. 187, Soja, 1993 #134] The idea is to reach out empathetically to other marginalized groups who share a similar social and spatial oppression of geohistorical underdevelopment.

Postmodern identity politics are often critiqued as being too fragmented to be politically worthwhile. A similar critique asks how one should know when to be modernist or postmodernist.[6] Once again, the problem is one of spatial assumptions. The term "politics" is usually associated with the term "public." Unfortunately, the spatial imagination of most has confined public to mean the space of the nation-state and its various spatial extensions. To act politically is to act in this particular public. However, this public is the hegemonic spatial production of modernism. Publics can be any collection of people where views are aired, ideas are discussed, or commitments are made. These alternative publics, or "counter-publics," can be places where those dominated by the

[6]Of course, "both" and "more" might be the best answer. This binary choice excludes other options such as radical feminism and postcolonialism. The postmodern identity politics that I argue for further down in this paragraph leaves options open to these other possibilities. However, it does not do enough to develop what these other political imaginations might be like.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

rationalized conceived space of the hegemonic public can create community and foster creativity and resistance (Fraser, 1994). They are the places where postmodernist identities can be expressed and explored, and maybe even validated. Simultaneously, the empathy for all spatially marginalized groups can be practiced in the dominant public sphere of the nation-state, such as voting against anti-Affirmative Action legislation such as California's Proposition 209.

Postmodern identity politics is takes the identities that space produces and then actively develops counter-spaces, sometimes as counter-publics, to draw from those identities in a radical, creative, and open way. Critical pedagogists imagine the classroom as a potential counter-public site. Some say that this type of postmodernism revels in fragmentation. It is insulting to suggest that any caring person sees fragmentation as solely positive. What postmodern identity politics, as well as spatial praxis, offers is a way to hold modernism morally and politically accountable for the very marginalization it produces. Focusing on the margins or "fragments" is a way to validate lived space amongst those who share similar spatialities and critically transform conceived and perceived space by deconstructing the monolithic notion of a singular public and constructing counter-publics. All of this while still keeping open the possibilities of participating in more modernistic politics.

I will conclude and summarize by addressing the question, "What would a critical multicultural curriculum that is also spatially critical look like?" First, spatiality would be a central focus of most readings, analyses, and discussions. In particular, the goal would be to identify dominant spatial conceptualizations and practices, such as the double illusion, and bring marginal lived spatialities to a privileged place. The production of marginalized identities via the social intersectionality of the real-and-imagined spaces of racism, capitalism, and

sexism should be a primary device for deconstructing hegemonic spatialities. People should learn to identify Firstspace, Secondspace, and Thirdspace epistemologies as helpful, heuristic categories to think critically about space, but not as dogmatic conceived space. Thirdspace literatures such as postmodernism, postcolonialism, or radical feminism would be commonly read. The concept of spatial underdevelopment in both its material and conceptual expressions should be created as an important spatial trope. Spatial praxis should also be developed as one possible Thirdspace methodology or "literacy" for interrogating a text whether spoken, written, or other. And finally, and possibly most importantly, critical spatial theory is primarily about rethinking the political imagination. Postmodern identity politics, or any other Thirdspatial politics, should be offered as a new possibility for social living. If curriculum truly is an "introduction into a way of life" as Giroux argues, then space can and must play a major role in the very nature of being critical of how hegemony is produced and reproduced.

REFERENCES

Best, S., & Kellner, D. (1991). In search of the postmodern. In S. Best & D. Kellner (Eds.), Postmodern theory: Critical interrogations, (pp. 1-33). New York: The Guilford Press.

Fraser, N. (1994). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. In H. A. Giroux & P. McLaren (Eds.), Between Borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies, (pp. 74-98). New York: Routledge.

Hammer, R., & McLaren, P. (1991). Rethinking the dialectic: A social semiotic perspective for educators. Educational Theory, 41 (1), 23-46.

Kuhn, T. S. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions. (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Soja, E., & Hooper, B. (1993). The spaces that difference makes: Some notes on the geographical margins of the new cultural politics. In M. Keith & S. Pile (Eds.), Place and the politics of identity, (pp. 183-205). London: Routledge.

Soja, E. W. (1989). Postmodern geographies: The reassertion of space in critical social theory. New York: Verso.

Soja, E. W. (1993). Postmodern geographies and the critique of historicism. In J. P. J. III, W. Natter, & T. R. Schatzki (Eds.), Postmodern contentions: Epochs, politics, space, (pp. 113-36). New York: The Guilford Press.

Soja, E. W. (1996). Thirdspace. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Wallerstein, I. (1979). The capitalist world-economy. New York: Cambridge University Press.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE